

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed August 15, 2006 has been carefully considered. Claims 1, 5 and 14 have been amended and claim 4 has been cancelled. The application now contains Claims 1-3 and 5-14 and no fee is due for the claims.

Applicant hereby petitions for a three-month extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. The fee for such petition is enclosed.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 6, 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by McNicol (U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0078075 A1), claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McNicol in view of Nilsson (U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2004/0164918), claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McNicol in view of Patton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,571,110), claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McNicol in view of Patton et al. and in further view of Judd et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,597,325), 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McNicol in view of Judd (U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0071761), claims 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McNicol in view of Judd and in further view of Smith et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,102,758), and claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McNicol in view of Patton et al. in view of Judd et al. in further view of Nilsson and still further in view of Smith et al.


Applicant respectfully disagrees with the conclusions reached by the Examiner relative to any of the references cited or any combination thereof. Specifically, the Examiner's reliance on the combination of McNicol and Patton is unfounded. There is neither any teaching or suggestion in either McNicol or Patton to combine the primary and secondary RF ports and a passive power divider in the primary RF port with the base station transceiver of McNicol. In

fact, the applications for both inventions are entirely different, so there would be no motivation to combine such technology.

Given the Examiner's comments and bases for rejection, the remaining references cited by the Examiner are moot in light of the amendment and comments. Applicant submits that amended claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the references cited by the Examiner taken alone or in combination. Applicant further submits that dependent claims 2-3 and 5-13 distinguish over the references of record for the same reason as claim 1 (amended), and are therefore also in condition for immediate allowance. Claim 14 includes the same limitations and claim 1 (amended), and applicant submits that such claim is now in condition for immediate allowance for the same reasons as claim 1 (amended).

In light of the amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully submits that this application is now in condition for allowance, and an early Notice of Allowance is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'James G. Coplit', is written over a horizontal line.

James G. Coplit

Reg. No. 40,571

Attorney for Applicant